

Date: Fri, 9 Sep 94 04:30:17 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #434  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 9 Sep 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 434

Today's Topics:

                    CW Transmitters ARE  
            Equipment modification & the FCC (2 msgs)  
                    More Code.  
                    Sum'tin for nut'in a  
                    Sum'tin for nut'in an  
            Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free (2 msgs)  
                    What is wrong with ha

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Thu, 8 Sep 94 00:11:00 -0400  
From: olivea!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!  
gatech!udel!news.sprintlink.net!ns.channel1.com!channel1!alan.wilensky@ames.arpa  
Subject: CW Transmitters ARE  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

KC>>I tried it, it works great! Fantastic....I didnt know you could do  
KC>>things like this.

KC>>

KC>>Alan Wilensky, N1SS0

KC>Come now, Al, own up; this doesn't smell kosher... you didn't really  
KC>duplicate this circuit, did you?

KC>First of all, where did you find a 14 milliHertz rock? And secondly,

KC>what did you substitute for the GE-1? Perhaps a CK-722 you have in  
KC>the junkbox?

You caught me, I was just trying to stroke Jeff in a nice way. I got  
strated in electronics by doing many similar things, like taking tv's  
and radios apart.

Alan Wilensky, N1SS0  
abm@world.std.com

---

\* CmpQwk #UNREG\* UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

-----  
Date: 07 Sep 94 18:10:04 -  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
gatech!udel!ssnet.com!ssalpha!Larry.Roll@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Equipment modification & the FCC  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

-=> Quoting veltman  
etcom.com to All <=

ve> From: veltman@netcom.com (paul Veltman)

ve> L. Floyd (lfloyd@netcom.com) wrote:  
ve> : I have a 2-meter HT that I have modified for use for Navy MARS (and  
ve> I have : a MARS license). That is, I modified it to transmit outside  
ve> the ham : bands. Would the FCC have heartburn with this?

Paul: No Problem. The Amateur Radio Service permits it's licensees to  
operate non-type accepted equipment on \*amateur\* frequencies.

ve> : Taking this a step further: I own a sailboat and I want to use my  
ve> modified : 2-meter HT on the marine bands while sailing. Assuming I  
ve> have a valid : marine license, would the FCC have heartburn with this?

Yes, very much so. Different service operating under different set of  
rules. Although it may be technically possible for you to transmit and  
receive marine frequencies, using a non-type accepted transceiver on these  
bands is a violation of FCC rules.

ve> : In other words, does the FCC care if a rig is modified for use in  
ve> the : service for which it was manufactured? Does the FCC care if a  
ve> rig is : modified for use outside the service for which it was  
ve> manufactured?  
ve> : Any insight on this will be appreciated!

They care VERY much. Fines are in the multi-kilobucks and prison terms up to a year. Do you want to be some yardbird's "girlfriend" for a year? Just to use an illegal marine transceiver? I think not. Forget it.

73 de Larry, WR2F

... Amateur Radio Operators have Extra Class!

--

|Fidonet: Larry Roll 1:2600/135

|Internet: Larry.Roll@ssalpha.com

|

| Standard disclaimer: The views of this user are strictly his own.

-----

Date: 8 Sep 1994 11:11:12 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
news.umbc.edu!eff!neoucom.edu!news.ysu.edu!yfn.ysu.edu!ae674@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Equipment modification & the FCC

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In a previous article, CSLE87@email.mot.com (Karl Beckman) says:

>In article <lfloydCvo5Ex.Jy2@netcom.com>, lfloyd@netcom.com (L. Floyd)  
>wrote:

>

>> I have a 2-meter HT that I have modified for use for Navy MARS (and I have  
>> a MARS license). That is, I modified it to transmit outside the ham  
>> bands. Would the FCC have heartburn with this?

>

>No, since type ACCEPTANCE is not required for amateur radio gear and you  
>can even build your own rig from scratch.

>>

>> Taking this a step further: I own a sailboat and I want to use my modified  
>> 2-meter HT on the marine bands while sailing. Assuming I have a valid  
>> marine license, would the FCC have heartburn with this?

>

(stuff deleted)

>

>By the way, does anybody understand the difference between "marine" and  
>"maritime" operation as defined by the FCC?? Marine is when you are inside  
>the coastal limits of the USA and therefore subject to FCC jurisdiction.  
>Maritime operation is ONLY in international waters and you are then subject  
>only to the International Maritime requirements.

>

>>

>> In other words, does the FCC care if a rig is modified for use in the  
>> service for which it was manufactured? Does the FCC care if a rig is

>> modified for use outside the service for which it was manufactured?  
>  
>Absolutely - call your local FCC Field Enforcement Office for further...

The BIG question is whether fcc type acceptance has any relevancy in international waters? I asked a local ham whether you could use your HT (ham) in international waters. Heel thought that it still wouldn't be legal if your on a U.S. flag vessel, since you would still be subject to U.S. laws. But it probably wouldn't matter if you just wanted to use your HT on low power to talk to the bridge. But informing the FCC might not be a great idea.

Reid Savage N9syw

--

Reid Savage N9syw  
4015 Hiawatha Dr.  
Madison,WI 53711  
(608)-238-9870

-----  
Date: Thu, 8 Sep 1994 07:18:09 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!  
F180-086.net.wisc.edu!bmicales@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: More Code.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <34ki65\$N9h@cat.cis.Brown.EDU> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>bmicales@facstaff.wisc.edu (Bruce Micales) writes:

>> True they are easy, however, you stated that no one modifies their radios  
>> any more....there was nothing indicating the degree of difficulty to this  
>> statement.

>Opening a radio and snipping a wire can hardly be considering "modifying  
>their radio". I equate that action connecting a VCR to a TV.

There is a lot more involved than just opening a radio, snipping a part, and closing the radio. You have better know something about handling IC if you want to avoid the possibility of "blowing" some ICs due to static electricity, better ID the correct part to cut, and reconstruct the radio in the correct manner. However, since you consider all of this (I guess adding a scan feature to a radio that did have one in it also would not be considered a modification -- I have done this) to be the same as connecting a VCR to a TV (you have to open your VCR, remove a part, just to connect it to a TV ..that must me some system :- ) ), I suggest the following:

1) Don't make sweeping statements, state exactly what you mean. You did not state what you considered a modification.

2) What do you consider a modification?

>> Again, you stated that no one knew what was in their radio...no specifics  
>> were given. Some schematics do come with block diagrams that nicely point  
>> out what the chip may do and the ID of that chip (my ICOM IC-2GAT does).

>New hams today don't know what's in their radio. They know what a component  
>is, sure. So what?

My point was that a schematic does show what you have in your radio. These schematics (for the most part) do tell what you have and its function.

> Ask a ham today how to construct a 455khz IF filter and you get a "duh?".

Simple answer : that is what books are for or ask! I don't carry around in my head the schematics for a particular piece of equipment. However, I have reference books (and other hams) that I use to answer questions that I may have. I am sure many new hams also do this.

>> No - this is not what I mean. What does a change in SWR mean? What can  
>> cause it? How do I locate the problem and fix it? These are just some  
>> examples of "troubleshooting" and repair that a ham should be able to do.

>But none of these are skills that normal people won't have. If your TV  
>set suddenly goes all snowy, most people are intelligent enough to know  
>to check the antenna connection, etc. (or, today, to call and blame the  
>cable company). Knowing that you might have a coax connection problem  
>if someone tells you your signal dropped suddenly isn't a skill, its common  
>sense.

Or you could have water in your coax which may be a bad connection or a break in the coax. Also may be something is wrong with your transmitter.. check it with a dummy load. These may not seem like skills to you since (as you say) they are common sense. However, these are common sense items that an amateur operator should know and not normal people. Besides, these were only examples of things that might go wrong.

73 de WA2DEU  
Bruce Micales

-----

Date: Thu, 8 Sep 94 00:11:00 -0400

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!  
udel!news.sprintlink.net!ns.channel1.com!channel1!alan.wilensky@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in a  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

JH>Todd, both you and Alan have misrepresented and skewed what Mike  
JH>said. No bigotry was shown on his part.

Jeff:

I did not respond to Dennigans class demographics, he posted it in  
response to my posting.

I still do not find a thread of logic in your opposition to a license  
class that exchanges code proficiency for technical proficiency.

If you want to go to email, I can give some ideas that I have regarding  
current deficiencies in the current license structure that could be  
included in the pools.

I these new operators were to confine themselves to phone and data only  
segments, there would be very little negative impact on the CW operators,  
especially if CW sub-bands were greatly increased in size.

The exchange of higher technical and practical testing standard answers  
the stupid "dumbing down" refrain.

The agreement to confine use to phone sub bands answers interferece  
complaints.

So you have a number of new ops that use phone exclusively, what is the  
damage? They have proven their sincerity by passing higher standards of  
technical and operation proficiency.

How can you object.

BTW, If I came to Hawaii, would you tutor me on the morse code, if you  
had time? One hell of a vacation, say what? And once I pass extra, I can  
debate with you on CW using CW!

Alan Wilensky, N1SS0  
abm@world.std.com

---

\* CmpQwk #UNREG\* UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

-----

Date: Thu, 8 Sep 1994 14:07:57 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!  
uwm.edu!mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in an  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <940907164954178@digcir.cts.com> greg.smith@digcir.cts.com (Greg Smith) writes:

>Because it is the ONLY language that Amateurs across the world can  
>understand!!! In the event of an emergency, it may be the ONLY way  
>to communicate, by shorting two wires together.

Big emphasis on "MAY" in the above sentence. Pretty unlikely. In an emergency situation, working CW DX on HF does you little good. I'll opt for a local repeater any time.

Curious, Greg...what is your code speed in WPM when using two stripped wires in an emergency situation? 20 WPM? Even 5?? I doubt it!

>For those of you complaining about a pesky 5wpm, are you going  
>to be able to live with the fact that my MOMMY is better than you?

She's not better (or worse), just different. Totally bogus arguments here, Greg.

--

```
/`- _      kevin.jessup@mixcom.com |  
{      }/ Marquette Electronics, Inc | Time for another tea party!  
\      / Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA |  
|__*| N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio |
```

-----

Date: Tue, 6 Sep 94 14:57:05 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!alberta!bigbrd!crs-sys!ersys!adec23!  
mark@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>Amateur examinations have always had two components: a theoretical side,  
>and a practical applications or operating side. The CW examination  
>tests the latter.

Ok, then the answer, folks, is to provide a test on how to talk on the radio ... How many of you can prove to me that you know how to talk? ;-/

Ok ... OK ... I got it!!! A spelling bee/poetry reading :-) :-) :-) instead of the CW exam!

Ciao -- 73 de VE6MGS/Mark -sk-

-----  
Date: 8 Sep 1994 16:09:51 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!  
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!fallout!  
cmoore@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gregory brown (gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu) wrote:

: You may be  
: mistaking good electronic keyer generated code for machine  
: generated...unless that's what you mean by "machine generated", which  
: of course it isn't if you're talking about automatic "encoding" and  
: "decoding".: Greg WB0RTK

Uh, Greg, an electronic keyer is a machine and no Morse coder worth his salt would be caught dead using anything but two bare wires. :-)

With an electronic keyer, it doesn't matter how bad a ham's fist is... He is not even sending dashes and dots, he's just holding the paddle to one side or the other... maybe I should have said machine assisted code instead of machine generated code. Even a bug is mechanically machine assisted. Only a straight key is real Morse code. There's no more electronics in a CW keyboard than in a good electronic keyer.

73, KG7BK, 00TC, Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com (Not speaking for Intel)

-----  
Date: 8 Sep 1994 13:57:16 GMT  
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsfeed.ksu.ksu.edu!  
moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!unlinfo.unl.edu!gbrown@ames.arpa  
Subject: What is wrong with ha  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Greg Smith (greg.smith@digcir.cts.com) wrote:

: ==> Quoting Gregory Brown to All <=-

: GB> Wouldn't a

: GB> ham, exercising his/her free will, : choose to learn CW even if it were



: GB> not required.

: Yes, but the Amateur Service is a "Private" radio service and is  
: controlled by the FCC. There is no "free will" of communications  
: here. The first amendment does NOT apply. The FCC says WHAT  
: kinds of emissions are permissible and WHAT kinds of messages  
: are acceptable.

: SHORTWAVE listeners probably know at least SOME CW because they want  
: to. I defy you to name three other groups that have learned CW  
: because "They Wanted To!"

: That's like asking a Windows user to understand DOS before he  
: can use Windows! RIDICULOUS!  
: ... Of all the things I've lost, I miss my mind the most!  
: \_\_\_ Blue Wave/QWK v2.12

First, and most importantly to me, is that I did not say what you  
quote above. I DID NOT SAY WHAT YOU QUOTE ABOVE! Got that?? Please  
read more carefully. Thank you.

Second, your point is mute. "Free will" and the First Amendment have  
nothing to do with this, and I'd never even consider bringing them up.  
I'm sure that many people would be happy to accept a ham license without  
code testing...they'd also be happy to accept a license without theory  
testing. There's no point to be made along these lines.

Third, I don't care if no one learns code "because they want to".  
(Remember, I didn't say that). They learn code because that is what  
is required to achieve their goal of being a licensed ham. Later, if  
they really do learn the code, they find it is useful, satisfying,  
and fun. That's the way it is with many things in life we'd rather  
not learn or do at first.

Fourth, the ONLY valid argument against code testing is its relevance  
to HF access, not its "inefficiency", "obsolescence", or  
"difficulty". As long as "international goodwill" is part of this  
service, CW and code is readily accessible to hams in economically and  
technically less "advanced" countries in the world, and it is still a  
mode which is favored by many (many) hams around the world, it is  
still very relevant to HF access.

Greg Brown WB0RTK

Please note: The only things \_\_I\_\_ said are the things which extend  
to the left margin of this post! All those little :,>,:,>> things  
really do mean something.

-----  
Date: Thu, 8 Sep 94 14:37:06 GMT  
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!  
alberta!adec23!mark@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <jchandleCvqIx5.Mtr@netcom.com>, <090794053758Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
<34ksla\$tc@nyx10.cs.du.edu>  
Subject : Re: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> wrote:  
>I just wish that people would learn that not everyone can learn the code,

I just wish that people would lurn that nut uvrywon can lurn to speek,

Ciao -- Mark

-----  
Date: 8 Sep 1994 13:02:02 GMT  
From: agate!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!pstc3!md@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <090794053758Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <34ksla\$tc@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,  
<090794205859Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>  
Subject : Re: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

In article <090794205859Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

|> The issue is relevance.

If the issue is relevance, then you've already lost. CW is very relevant to HF operations, for several reasons. Two that I can think of offhand are utilization and limited modes of contact. Many people still use CW on HF (50% of the QSOs by Jeff's count are in CW). Further, CW is the only mode of contact which some countries have, hence, to satisfy international goodwill, you need to know CW to communicate with them effectively.

Now, you may say that you don't want to work CW HF, and if you don't want to work it why should you be tested on it. But, as I've said numerous times, you can apply that same argument to various aspects of the theory tests as well. If I don't want to build my own antennas why should I know

how to make a dipole. And, your arguments countering my statement can just as easily be applied to the CW test.

MD

```
--  
-- #queue <dire_straits.voc>  
-- "I want my,  
--   I want my,  
--   I want my free HF..."
```

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #434

\*\*\*\*\*